REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-6 are pending in the present application. Claim 3 has been amended herewith. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I.   35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 3 (and dependent Claims 4-6), the Examiner notes concerns with the phrase 'responsive to identifying references' as such phrase is alleged to have insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation. The Examiner gives no reasons why this phrase has insufficient antecedent basis, and Applicants note that such phrase does not improperly use 'the' or 'said' during a first occurrence of such phraseology usage. Applicants have in any event amended Claim 3 in an attempt to appease the Examiner's concerns.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

II.   35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

Claims 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hamada et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0078105), hereinafter "Hamada". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As an initial matter, Applicants have amended Claim 3 in accordance with the Specification description on pages 10 and 13, in order to emphasize that there are two separate steps/actions associated with retrieval of information regarding the remote portal fragment and references thereto (meta-information and markup).

As to Claim 3, such claim recites "merging the existing navigation tree with the navigation tree of the remote portal fragment to be integrated resulting in a new navigation tree; and rendering an integrated portal page by traversing the new navigation tree". As can be seen, a new navigation tree results from the merging of an existing navigation tree with the navigation tree of the remote portal fragment. Then, and importantly, after this new navigation tree has been formed by such merging operation, this new navigation tree is then traversed to render the integrated portal page. During such rendering operation, when references to the remote portal fragment are identified, communication is established with the remote portal to receive a markup of the remote portal fragment for displaying the remote portal fragment into the integrated portal page. Thus, there is a two-phased approach where a new navigation tree is

formed from both the existing navigation tree and the navigation tree of the remote portal fragment - and such new navigation tree is formed in conjunction with the meta-information that is received - followed by a rendering operation of such new navigation tree whereby markup of the remote portal fragment is received upon encountering references to such remote portal fragment in the newly created navigation tree.

In rejecting such new tree formation and subsequent rendering operation, the Examiner cites Hamada's description at paragraphs [0067], [0267] and [0268] as teaching all such claimed features. Applicants urge clear error, as will now be shown in detail.

At paragraph [0067] of Hamada, the following is described:

> [0067] In the present invention, the composition web document (which will also be referred to as a composition web page) to be a basis of the composition is described by the XML, a portion (partial document) of a range specified from the other specified web document is extracted and inserted into a specified position in the composition web document, and a conversion processing (a processing for conversion into a desired document structure) is applied to a specified range of the composition web document. Thus the present invention adopts a policy of providing two composition logic commands including insertion and conversion as elements in the composition web document.

As can be seen, this cited passage at paragraph [0067] describes generation of a 'composition web document', which the Examiner is presumably interpreting as being equivalent to the claimed 'new navigation tree'.

At paragraph [00267] of Hamada, the following is described:

> [0267] As shown in FIG. 18, a plurality of textbook data exist in the web document "http://www.xxx.com/booklist.xml", so that all of them are inserted as the XML-DOM trees of the partial documents of this web document.

As can be seen, this cited passage at paragraph [0267] describes insertion of web trees into a web document, which is again the process of generating a 'new navigation tree'.

At paragraph [00267] of Hamada, the following is described:

> [0268] On the other hand, at the step S207, the interpretation processing of the pz:convert element E3 is carried out by the procedure shown in FIG. 15.

As can be seen, this cited passage at paragraph [0268] also describes a process for generating the 'new navigation tree' as depicted in Hamada Figure 15.

Importantly, none of these cited references describe post-processing of such 'new navigation tree' during a rendering operation, as is provided by the features of Claim 3, as the cited reference does not describe _any_ rendering operation at all. Thus, this cited reference cannot teach the claimed steps of responsive to identifying references to the remote portal fragment in the new navigation tree during rendering - where such new navigation tree is formed in conjunction with the meta-information that is received - establishing communication with the remote portal and receiving a markup of the remote portal fragment for displaying the remote portal fragment into the integrated portal page, as erroneously alleged by the Examiner in the rejection of such claim. Therefore, it is urged that Claim 3 has been erroneously rejected as every element recited therein is not identically shown in a single reference.[1]

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 4-6 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 3 (of which Claims 4-6 depend upon).

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

III.   Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over Hamada and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: November 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants

---

[1] For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. _In re Bond_, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).